Page 59, line 22, after "fibrotic diseases (23)", please add the following:
--Plasmids pHF1 and pHB15 were deposited with the American Type Culture Collection (Rockville, Maryland), which assigned them accession No. 75058 and No. 75059, respectively.--

IN THE CLAIMS

Please cancel claim 17 without prejudice or disclaimer, and add the following new claims:

20. An isolated DNA sequence that hybridizes, with mRNA for α platelet-derived growth factor receptor protein.

21. The DNA sequence of claim 20 which also hybridizes with a cDNA insert contained in plasmid pHF1, deposited under ATCC accession No. 75058.

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 16-19 are pending. Applicants propose to delete claim 17, without prejudice or disclaimer, and to add claims 20 and 21. If Examiner Marschel enters the proposed amendment, claims 1-7, 16 and 19-21 will be pending in this application.

Support for new claims 20 and 21 can be found, *inter alia*, in the specification at page 10, lines 4-15 (description of cDNA clone "HF1"), and on page 20, lines 7-21, where a plasmid containing clone HF1 (pHF1) is described. Applicants also have amended the specification to note that pHF1 has ATCC accession No. 75058. Accordingly, no new matter has been added with this amendment.

Miscellaneous Points

In the Official Action at page 2, third full paragraph, the examiner has stated that the "amendment filed 7/23/91 has been entered...but that the deletions on pages 73-88 were difficult to understand since these correspond to pages of drawings but were not labeled as such in the amendment." Applicants regret any confusion engendered in this regard, but they can confirm that the designated pages are correct and that these pages contain drawings, the captions for which have been deleted by the aforementioned amendment. Indeed, the line numbers mentioned in that amendment correspond to the text of the various drawing captions.

On page two, in paragraph 4 of the Official Action, the examiner requests that applicants submit a new abstract containing a description of "the DNA compositions" claimed. Applicants therefore submit the attached abstract, drafted to conform to PTO practice.

Rejections under 35 USC §112

The examiner has objected to the specification and rejected claims 1-7 and 16-19 under the first and second paragraphs of §112. In this regard the examiner has focussed on an alleged ambiguity concerning "clone T11" and the absence from the record of a statement guaranteeing the availability to the public of "the clones and probes."

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, asserting that the present specification clearly teaches a repeatable method for obtaining the disclosed clones and probes. In further response, however, applicants would call attention to their deposit on August 9, 1991, with the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) of plasmids pHF1 and pHB15, assigned accession

numbers 75058 and 75059, respectively. The specification has been amended to reflect this information.

Plasmid pHB15 contains a nucleotide sequence that hybridizes with mRNA of β platelet-derived growth factor receptor protein, while plasmid pHF1 contains a nucleotide sequence that hybridizes with mRNA for α platelet-derived growth factor receptor protein. See the original specification, for example, at page 20, lines 7-21, and in Figure 2, wherein cDNA clones are disclosed.

Proposed claim 20 is directed to an isolated DNA sequence which hybridizes with mRNA for α platelet-derived growth factor receptor protein and, proposed 21 adds the further limitation that such DNA sequence additionally hybridizes with the HF1 cDNA insert contained in pHF1 (ATCC No. 75058.) Claims 20 and 21 thus prescribe a capability to hybridize with a constituent of pHF1 which is fully supported in the original application. Entry of these proposed claims is respectfully requested.

As to the confusion regarding the clone T11 and the alleged discrepancy between Figures 2 and 3, applicants assert that this issue is mooted by the cancellation of claim 17, which recited the T11 genomic clone. Applicants maintain, however, that the T11 genomic clone is fully described and enabled in their specification as filed, and that no discrepancy exits between Figures 2 and 3. Figure 2 represents the restriction map for the T11 genomic clone from which the nucleotide sequence of Figure 3 derives. Contrary to the examiner's assertion, T11 does not "only contain the exons designated in Figure 3 as a, b and c." The genomic T11 clone encompasses, but is not limited to, the sequence of Figure 3. The fact that T11 terminates with an *EcoR* I is irrelevant to Figure 3.

In any event, the present claims do not recite "clone T11." Rather, the claims refer to the DNA of Figure 3 or, as in new claim 20, to DNA which hybridizes with mRNA of α platelet derived growth factor protein and which hybridizes with a specific, deposited oligonucleotide probe.

In this regard, the undersigned representative of the applicants, having the registration number designated below, states that plasmids pHF1 and pHB15 have been deposited with the ATCC under the terms of the Budapest Treaty and will be released to the public, irrevocably and without restriction or condition, upon issuance of a patent in this case.

In light of the foregoing, applicants submit that the specification and claims meet every requirement of §112 and that claims 1-7, 16 and 18-20 are in condition for allowance. An early notification to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should Dr. Marschel feel that any other point requires consideration, she is invited to contact the undersigned at (703)836-9300.

Respectfully submitted,

April 20, 1992
Date

Patricia D. Granados
Patricia D. Granados
Registration No. 33,683

FOLEY & LARDNER
P.O. Box 299
Alexandria, Virginia 22313
(703) 836-9300